

REMARKS

By this amendment, claim 6 has been amended. Claims 1-5 and 8-19 have been previously withdrawn. Accordingly, claims 6, 7 and 20-25 are currently pending in the application, of which claim 6 is independent.

Entry of this Amendment is respectfully requested because it places the present application in condition for allowance, or in the alternative, better form for appeal. No new matters are believed to be added in this response.

In view of the above Amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Claim Objection

In the Office Action, claim 6 has been objected to for informality and ambiguity issues. This objection is respectfully traversed.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that the limitation “a black matrix” lacks proper antecedent basis as not having been previously introduced into the claim. This assertion is respectfully disagreed because “a black matrix” in line 4 is the first time this limitation is introduced to claim 6.

If claim 6 recites “*the* black matrix” in line 4 and “*a* black matrix” has not been previously introduced into the claim, there would be an antecedent basis issue. However, “*a* black matrix” in line 4 is the first occurrence and hence should not raise any antecedent basis issue. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection for claim 6.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 5,568,293 issued to Takao, *et al.* (“Takao”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 6 recites:

“6. A method for fabricating a liquid crystal display, the method comprising steps of:
forming a black matrix on a substrate; and
sequentially forming a plurality of color filters neighboring each other *on the substrate and the black matrix*, each color filter having a flat central portion and a peripheral portion, wherein the peripheral portion overlaps the black matrix and is *consistently tapered* as advancing from an interface with the flat central portion toward the neighboring color filters.”

According to claim 6, the black matrix is formed on the substrate and the color filters are formed on the substrate and the black matrix. Also, the peripheral portion of each color filter overlaps the black matrix. For example, Fig. 5 of the present application shows that the black matrix 210 is formed on the substrate, and that the color filters (R, G, B) are formed on the substrate 200 and the black matrix 210.

In this regard, Takao describes “Next, on the glass substrate having the colored pattern of the three colors formed thereon, ... a light intercepting layer 117 with a light intercepting pattern is formed in conformity with the gap between the respective units ... by use of a black colored resin material” (column 19, lines 18-23). Since the light intercepting layer 117 is formed after the colored patterns 114, 115, 116 are formed on the glass substrate 111, Takao fails to disclose or suggest the claimed step of “sequentially forming a plurality of color filters ... on the substrate and the black matrix”, as claimed.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claim 6.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,271,902 issued to Ogura, *et al.* (“Ogura”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In this response, claim 6 has been amended to recite “the peripheral portion ... is *consistently tapered* as advancing from an interface with the flat central portion toward the neighboring color filters.”

In this regard, Fig. 3G of Ogura shows the color filter B has a flat central portion and a peripheral portion. The peripheral portion becomes *thicker* as advancing from the interface with the flat central portion to the portion where the color filter B overlaps the color filter G. Then, the peripheral portion is tapered as advancing from the portion where the color filter B overlaps the color filter G. Thus, Ogura fails to disclose or suggest “the peripheral portion ... is *consistently tapered* as advancing from an interface with the flat central portion toward the neighboring color filters.”

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claim 6.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Takao in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,725,975 issued to Nakamura, *et al.* (“Nakamura”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 7 is dependent from claim 6. As previously mentioned, claim 6 is believed to be patentable over Takao. For example, Takao fails to disclose or suggest “sequentially forming a plurality of color filters ... on the substrate and the black matrix”, as recited in claim 6.

Nakamura is directed to a gradation mask having at least three different transmittances. However, Nakamura does not disclose or suggest forming color filters on the substrate and the black matrix. Thus, Nakamura fails to cure the deficiency of Takao.

Since none of the cited references discloses or suggests this claimed feature, the subject matter of claim 6 would not have been obvious over them. Thus, it is submitted that claim 6 is patentable over Takao and Nakamura. Claim 7 that is dependent from claim 6 would be also patentable at least for the same reason.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 7.

Claims 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Ogura in view of Nakamura. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 7 is dependent from claim 6. As previously mentioned, amended claim 6 is believed to be patentable over Ogura. For example, Ogura fails to disclose or suggest “the peripheral portion ... is *consistently tapered as advancing from an interface with the flat central portion* toward the neighboring color filters.”

Nakamura is directed to a gradation mask having at least three different transmittances. However, Nakamura does not disclose or suggest a peripheral portion of a color filter

consistently tapered as advancing from an interface with the flat central portion toward the neighboring color filters. Thus, Nakamura fails to cure the deficiency of Ogura.

Since none of the cited references discloses or suggests this claimed feature, the subject matter of claim 6 would not have been obvious over them. Thus, it is submitted that claim 6 is patentable over Ogura and Nakamura. Claim 7 that is dependent from claim 6 would be also patentable at least for the same reason.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 7.

Claims 20-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Takao in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,567,150 issued to Kim (“Kim”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 20-25 are dependent from claim 6. As previously mentioned, claim 6 is believed to be patentable over Takao. For example, Takao fails to disclose or suggest “sequentially forming a plurality of color filters ... on the substrate and the black matrix”, as recited in claim 6.

Kim is directed to simultaneously patterning the intrinsic semiconductor material and the first insulating material to form a semiconductor layer, a gate insulating layer and a gate protecting layer. However, Kim does not disclose or suggest “sequentially forming a plurality of color filters ... on the substrate and the black matrix.” Thus, Kim fails to cure the deficiency from Takao.

Also, claim 20 recites the plurality of gate lines, the data lines, thin film transistors and pixel electrodes are formed on the same substrate on which the color filters are formed. In this regard, both Takao and Kim fail to disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

Since none of the cited references discloses or suggests these claimed features, the subject matter of claim 6 would not have been obvious over them. Thus, it is submitted that claim 6 is patentable over Takao and Kim. Claims 20-25 that are dependent from claim 6 would be also patentable at least for the same reason.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 20-25.

Claims 20-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Ogura in view of Kim. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 20-25 are dependent from claim 6. As previously mentioned, amended claim 6 is believed to be patentable over Ogura. For example, Ogura fails to disclose or suggest “the peripheral portion ... is *consistently tapered as advancing from an interface with the flat central portion* toward the neighboring color filters”, as recited in claim 6.

Kim is directed to simultaneously patterning the intrinsic semiconductor material and the first insulating material to form a semiconductor layer, a gate insulating layer and a gate protecting layer. However, Kim does not disclose or suggest “the peripheral portion ... is *consistently tapered as advancing from an interface with the flat central portion* toward the neighboring color filters”, as recited in claim 6. Thus, Kim fails to cure the deficiency from Ogura.

Also, claim 20 recites the plurality of gate lines, the data lines, thin film transistors and pixel electrodes are formed on the same substrate on which the color filters are formed. In this regard, both Ogura and Kim fail to disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

Since none of the cited references discloses or suggests these claimed features, the subject matter of claim 6 would not have been obvious over them. Thus, it is submitted that claim 6 is patentable over Ogura and Kim. Claims 20-25 that are dependent from claim 6 would be also patentable at least for the same reason.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 20-25.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submits that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard T. Schachner, Reg. No. 48,342, FOR
Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: February 24, 2005

McGuireWoods LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215
Tel: 703-712-5365
Fax: 703-712-5280
HCP:WSC/tmk

\\COM\488499.1